

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1459 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/601,234	10/30/2000	Kenichi Morigaki	MAT-799US 8757	
7590 06/16/2004		EXAMINER		
Lawrence E Ashery			TSANG FOSTER, SUSY N	
Ratner & Prestia Suite 301 One Westlakes Berwyn			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PO Box 980			1745	
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980			DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/601,234	MORIGAKI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Susy N Tsang-Foster	1745			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faill Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from I cause the application to become ABANDONEL	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 March 2004</u> .					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[<i>,</i> — ,,					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)	_				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		te atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 3/5/2004 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,090,505 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.
- 2. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 4/5/2004. Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, and 17-20 have been amended and claims 23-30 have been added. Previous art rejections based on JP 10-092424 A have been withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments and after further consideration by the Examiner. The terminal disclaimer filed on 3/5/2004 overcomes obviousness type double patenting rejections based on U.S. Patent No. 6,090,505. However, applicant did not file a terminal disclaimer for obviousness type double patenting rejections based on U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386. Claims 1-30 are pending and are rejected for reasons given below. This Office Action is made non-final as new grounds of rejection are made that are not necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Application/Control Number: 09/601,234

Art Unit: 1745

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 3, 10-14, 16, 23-25, and 30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in view of Kawakami et al. (US 5,824,434).

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 disclose all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 10-14, 16, 23-25, and 30 except a polymer gel electrolyte in the nonaqueous secondary battery and that the polymer gel electrolyte comprises polyethylene oxide.

Kawakami et al. teach that a polymer gel electrolyte is used in a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery because the use of a polymer gel electrolyte prevents leakage of liquid electrolyte from the battery and that a suitable polymer gel electrolyte comprises polyethylene oxide (see abstract and col. 20, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a polymer gel electrolyte comprising polyethylene oxide in the nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 because a polymer gel electrolyte comprising polyethylene oxide prevents leakage of liquid electrolyte from the battery.

5. Claims 8, 9, 14, 21, and 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in view of Iwamoto et al. (USP 5,589,296).

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 disclose all the limitations of claims 8, 9, 14, 21, and 22 except using a lithium ion conductive glass solid electrolyte instead of a separator and that the glass solid electrolyte is synthesized with row materials including a first component including at least a lithium sulfide, a second component including at least one of a silicon sulfide, a phosphor sulfide, and a boron sulfide, and a third component including at least one of lithium phosphate, lithium sulfate, lithium borate, and lithium silicate.

Iwamoto et al. teaches a solid electrolyte for a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery (col. 1, lines 15-20; col. 2, lines 24-27; col. 13, lines 2-5) that is a lithium ion conductive glass solid electrolyte and that the glass solid electrolyte is synthesized with row materials including (see col. 2, lines 51-60) a first component including at least a lithium sulfide, a second component including at least one of a silicon disulfide (a silicon sulfide), diphosphorous pentasulfide (a phosphor sulfide), and a boron sulfide; and a third component including at least one of lithium phosphate, lithium sulfate, and lithium silicate (which is lithium orthosilicate) to give a solid electrolyte having a distinguished ion conductivity (col. 2, lines 5-11) and prevent leakage problems due to using liquid electrolytes (col. 1, lines 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the lithium ion conductive glass solid electrolyte of Iwamoto et al. that is synthesized with row materials including a first component including at least a lithium sulfide, a second component including at least one of a silicon disulfide (a silicon sulfide), diphosphorous pentasulfide (a phosphor sulfide), and a boron sulfide; and a third component including at least one of lithium phosphate, lithium sulfate, and lithium silicate (which is lithium orthosilicate) in the nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 because the glass solid electrolyte has a distinguished ion conductivity and prevents leakage problems due to using liquid electrolytes as taught by Iwamoto et al. (col. 1, lines 24-30).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 15-17, 23, and 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in view of EP 730316 A1.

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 all the limitations of claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 15-17, 23, and 26 except that the positive electrode includes a polymer gel electrolyte and the negative electrode includes a polymer gel electrolyte and that the polymer is a polymer of vinylidene fluoride.

EP 730316 A1 teaches polyvinylidene (PVDF) homopolymer or polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) copolymer as the solid electrolyte material for a separator and for the positive and negative electrodes of a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery with electrolyte material being present in the separator and in the electrodes (see page 13, lines 35-50) because the PVDF provides for a porous structure in the separator and in the electrodes that would increase the

utilization of the active material and electrolyte material (see page 5, lines 24-29) due to enhanced electrolyte mobility from the porous structure. The PVDF copolymer can be copolymers of vinylidene fluoride and hexafluoropropylene (see page 4, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use PVDF homopolymer gel electrolyte or PVDF-HFP copolymer gel electrolyte as the polymer gel electrolyte in the battery of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 because the PVDF homopolymer gel electrolyte or PVDF-HFP copolymer gel electrolyte are stable and compatible in a nonaqueous secondary battery environment and are conventionally used in the art. The use of these polymer gel electrolytes in the separator and in the electrodes also gives increased efficiency in the battery due to the porous structure of the polymer as taught by EP 730316 A1.

Furthermore, it would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the polymer gel electrolyte in the electrodes of a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery because the use of the same polymer matrix in the electrode and in the separator (solid electrolyte) ensures chemical compatibility of the polymer as a binder for the electrodes with the polymer electrolyte.

7. Claims 6, 7, 19, 20, 23, 28, and 29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in view of Kawakami et al. (US 5,824,434) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Gies et al. (USP 5,665,265).

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in combination with Kawakami et al. (US 5824434) teach all the limitations of claims 6, 7, 19, 20, 23, 28, and 29

except that the polymer gel electrolyte includes a non-woven fabric of a polyolefin polymers, and that the polymer is a copolymer of methacrylate and an ethylene oxide.

Gies et al. teaches a polymer gel electrolyte that includes a non-woven fabric of polyolefin polymers (col. 3, lines 18-60) and that the polymer gel electrolyte can be polyethylene oxide, polymethylmethacrylate and copolymers thereof.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a polymer gel electrolyte include a non-woven fabric of polyolefin polymers for good mechanical integrity of the electrolyte as taught by Gies et al. (see col. 2, lines 15-20).

It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a copolymer of methacrylate and an ethylene oxide as the polymer gel electrolyte in a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery because the copolymer is capable of absorbing electrolyte species to form a gel polymer electrolyte and it is functionally equivalent to the polyethylene oxide used in the gel polymer electrolyte of the Kawakami et al. as taught by Gies et al. (col. 3, lines 44-58).

8. Claims 5, 18, 23, and 27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in view of Kawakami et al. (US 5,824,434) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of St. Aubyn Hubbard et al. (USP 5,460,903).

Claims 1, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 in combination with Kawakami et al. (US 5824434) teach all the limitations of claims 5, 18, 23, and 27 except that the polymer in the polymer gel electrolyte is a polyester polymer.

St. Aubyn Hubbard et al. teaches a polymer gel electrolyte comprising polyester polymer for a nonaqueous electrolyte secondary battery (see abstract; col.2, lines 33-45; col. 3, lines 1-15, lines 35-41 and lines 65-67) because polymer gel electrolytes containing polyester as the polymer provides for mechanical rigidity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polyester as the polymer in the polymer gel electrolyte in the battery of U.S. Patent No. 6,605,386 B1 because polymer gel electrolyte comprising polyester has improved mechanical stability.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to examiner Susy Tsang-Foster, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1293. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached at (571) 272-1292.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Application/Control Number: 09/601,234

Art Unit: 1745

Page 9

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

St Aury Isang Foster

Susy Tsang-Foster Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1745